UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/970,769	10/05/2001	Dmitry Gryaznov	19903.0005	1948

23517   7590   07/12/2005

SWIDLER BERLIN LLP
3000 K STREET, NW
BOX IP
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER
CERVETTI, DAVID GARCIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/970,769	GRYAZNOV, DMITRY
	Examiner	Art Unit
	David G. Cervetti	2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 April 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,7-17,19-25,28-38,40-46,49-59 and 61-72* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,7-17,19-25,28-38,40-46,49-59 and 61-72* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *21 April 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant's arguments filed April 21, 2005, have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive.

Response to Amendment

2.   The examiner withdraws the objection to the specification.

3.   The examiner approves the replacement sheet for figure 2 received on 21 April

2005. The examiner withdraws the objection to the drawings.

4.   Applicant states that Rowley merely suggests updating general software

applications. Examiner points out that the system of Rowley is directed to initiating an

update of a plurality of software applications/programs. As it is well known in the art,

anti-virus programs are also software applications. Clearly, the system disclosed by

Rowley does teach updating a plurality of applications, anti-virus and other types of

applications.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   **Claims 1, 4, 7-10, 13-14, 22, 25, 28-31, 34-35, 43, 46, 49-52, 55-56, and 64-65**

are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowley (US Patent

Number 5,999,740), and further in view of Hodges et al. (US Patent Number

6,035,423).

Regarding claim 1, Rowley teaches a method for automatically updating a

plurality of anti-virus programs comprising the steps of:

- initiating an update of a plurality of software applications (column 5, lines

22-28);

- determining information to be updated (column 5, lines 29-34);

- comparing at least one of version numbers, creation dates and

modification dates of update files stored on a virus update server with the

virus profiles (column 2, lines 23-54, column 5, lines 35-65);

- transferring a plurality of updates (column 5, lines 35-67, column 6, lines

1-13); and

- installing the plurality of updates (column 6, lines 14-29).

Rowley does not expressly disclose

-        initiating an update of a plurality of anti-virus programs by an update

control program; wherein each of the anti-virus programs is associated

with a virus profile that is separate from the plurality of anti-virus

programs and the update control program, and stored in memory;

wherein each virus profile includes virus signature patterns that allow the

anti-virus program associated with the virus profile to detect the presence

of viruses in files and transferred data that are being scanned by the anti-

virus program; or

-        scheduling when updates are to occur and which anti-virus programs of

the plurality of anti-virus programs are to be updated;

However, Hodges et al. teach

-        initiating an update of a plurality of anti-virus programs by an update

control program; wherein each of the anti-virus programs is associated

with a virus profile that is separate from the plurality of anti-virus

programs and the update control program, and stored in memory;

wherein each virus profile includes virus signature patterns that allow the

anti-virus program associated with the virus profile to detect the presence

of viruses in files and transferred data that are being scanned by the anti-

virus program (column 7, lines 1-67, column 8, lines 1-67);

-        scheduling when updates are to occur and which anti-virus programs of

the plurality of anti-virus programs are to be updated (column 7, lines 1-

67, column 8, lines 1-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hodges et al. with the system of Rowley. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it was well known in the art to update multiple applications.

Regarding claim 22, Rowley teaches a system for updating a plurality of anti-virus programs comprising:

- a processor operable to execute computer program instructions (column 3, lines 25-39);

- a memory operable to store computer program instructions executable by the processor (column 3, lines 25-39); and

- computer program instructions stored in the memory and executable to perform the steps of (column 3, lines 25-39):

  o initiating an update of a plurality of software applications (column 5, lines 22-28);

  o determining information to be updated (column 5, lines 29-34);

  o comparing at least one of version numbers, creation dates and modification dates of update files stored on a virus update server with the virus profiles (column 2, lines 23-54, column 5, lines 35-65);

  o transferring a plurality of updates (column 5, lines 35-67, column 6, lines 1-13); and

  o installing the plurality of updates (column 6, lines 14-29).

Rowley does not expressly disclose

-        initiating an update of a plurality of anti-virus programs by an update

control program; wherein each of the anti-virus programs is associated

with a virus profile that is separate from the plurality of anti-virus

programs and the update control program, and stored in the memory;

wherein each virus profile includes virus signature patterns that allow the

anti-virus program associated with the virus profile to detect the presence

of viruses in files and transferred data that are being scanned by the anti-

virus program; or

-        scheduling when updates are to occur and which anti-virus programs of

the plurality of anti-virus programs are to be updated;

However, Hodges et al. teach

-        initiating an update of a plurality of anti-virus programs by an update

control program; wherein each of the anti-virus programs is associated

with a virus profile that is separate from the plurality of anti-virus

programs and the update control program, and stored in memory;

wherein each virus profile includes virus signature patterns that allow the

anti-virus program associated with the virus profile to detect the presence

of viruses in files and transferred data that are being scanned by the anti-

virus program (column 7, lines 1-67, column 8, lines 1-67);

-        scheduling when updates are to occur and which anti-virus programs of

the plurality of anti-virus programs are to be updated (column 7, lines 1-

67, column 8, lines 1-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hodges et al. with the system of Rowley. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it was well known in the art to update multiple applications.

Regarding claim 43, Rowley teaches a computer program product for updating a plurality of anti-virus programs, comprising:

- a computer readable medium (column 3, lines 25-39, column 7, lines 10-15);

- computer program instructions, recorded on the computer readable medium, executable by a processor (column 3, lines 25-39, column 7, lines 10-15), for performing the steps of:

    o initiating an update of a plurality of software applications (column 5, lines 22-28)

    o determining information to be updated (column 5, lines 29-34);

    o comparing at least one of version numbers, creation dates and modification dates of update files stored on a virus update server with the virus profiles (column 2, lines 23-54, column 5, lines 35-65);

    o transferring a plurality of updates (column 5, lines 35-67, column 6, lines 1-13); and

    o installing the plurality of updates (column 6, lines 14-29).

Rowley does not expressly disclose

-        initiating an update of a plurality of anti-virus programs by an update

         control program; wherein each of the anti-virus programs is associated

         with a virus profile that is separate from the plurality of anti-virus

         programs and the update control programs and stored in the computer

         readable medium; wherein each virus profile includes virus signature

         patterns that allow the anti-virus program associated with the virus profile

         to detect the presence of viruses in files and transferred data that are

         being scanned by the anti-virus program; or

-        scheduling when updates are to occur and which anti-virus programs of

         the plurality of anti-virus programs are to be updated;

However, Hodges et al. teach

-        initiating an update of a plurality of anti-virus programs by an update

         control program; wherein each of the anti-virus programs is associated

         with a virus profile that is separate from the plurality of anti-virus

         programs and the update control programs and stored in the computer

         readable medium; wherein each virus profile includes virus signature

         patterns that allow the anti-virus program associated with the virus profile

         to detect the presence of viruses in files and transferred data that are

         being scanned by the anti-virus program (column 7, lines 1-67, column 8,

         lines 1-67);

-       scheduling when updates are to occur and which anti-virus programs of
        the plurality of anti-virus programs are to be updated (column 7, lines 1-
        67, column 8, lines 1-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at
the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hodges et al. with the
system of Rowley. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so
because it was well known in the art to update multiple applications.

Regarding claims 4, 25, and 46, the combination of Rowley and Hodges et al.
teaches the limitations as set forth under claims 1, 22, and 43 respectively above.
Furthermore, Rowley teaches wherein the determining step comprises the step of:
determining information to update based on information relating to the information to be
updated and on information relating to the plurality of updates (column 5, lines 29-41).

Regarding claims 7, 28, and 49, the combination of Rowley and Hodges et al.
teaches the limitations as set forth under claims 4, 25, and 46 respectively above.
Furthermore, Rowley teaches wherein the information relating to the information to be
updated and the information relating to the plurality of updates comprises script or data
files including information indicating the information to be updated and the information
relating to the plurality of updates (column 2, lines 23-54, column 5, lines 35-65).

Regarding claims 8, 29, and 50, the combination of Rowley and Hodges et al.
teaches the limitations as set forth under claims 1, 22, and 43 respectively above.
Furthermore, Rowley teaches wherein the transferring step comprises the step of:

transferring the update using a standard, non-standard, or proprietary protocol (column 3, lines 5-10, column 7, lines 10-15).

Regarding claims 9, 30, and 51, the combination of Rowley and Hodges et al. teaches the limitations as set forth under claims 8, 29, and 50 respectively above. Furthermore, Rowley teaches wherein the standard protocol comprises hypertext transfer protocol or file transfer protocol (column 3, lines 5-10, column 7, lines 10-15).

Regarding claims 10, 31, and 52, the combination of Rowley and Hodges et al. teaches the limitations as set forth under claims 1, 22, and 43 respectively above. Furthermore, Rowley teaches wherein the installing step comprises at least one of: decompressing a compressed update (column 6, lines 57-58), decrypting an encrypted update (column 6, lines 57-59), and copying a file included in an update to a directory (column 6, lines 53-67).

Regarding claims 13, 34, and 55, the combination of Rowley and Hodges et al. teaches the limitations as set forth under claims 4, 25, and 46 respectively above. Furthermore, Rowley teaches wherein the transferring step comprises the step of: transferring the update using a standard, non-standard, or proprietary protocol (column 3, lines 5-10, column 7, lines 10-15).

Regarding claims 14, 35, and 56, the combination of Rowley and Hodges et al. teaches the limitations as set forth under claims 13, 34, and 55 respectively above. Furthermore, Rowley teaches wherein the installing step comprises at least one of: decompressing a compressed update (column 6, lines 57-58), decrypting an encrypted

update (column 6, lines 57-59), and copying a file included in an update to a directory (column 6, lines 53-67).

Regarding claim 64, the combination of Rowley and Hodges et al. teaches the limitations as set forth under claim 1 above. Furthermore, Rowley teaches wherein the comparison involves file sizes, and presence or absence of files (column 2, lines 23-54, column 5, lines 35-65).

Regarding claim 65, the combination of Rowley and Hodges et al. teaches the limitations as set forth under claim 1 above. Furthermore, Rowley teaches wherein the comparison involves the version numbers, the creation dates, the modification dates, file sizes, and presence or absence of files (column 2, lines 23-54, column 5, lines 35-65).

7.   **Claims 2-3, 23-24, and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowley and Hodges et al. as applied to claims 1, 22, and 43 respectively above, and further in view of Fletcher et al. (US Patent Number: 6,009,274).**

Regarding claims 2, 23, and 44, the combination of Rowley and Hodges et al. does not expressly disclose wherein the initiating step comprises the step of: periodically initiating an update. Hodges et al. teach periodically updating an anti-virus application. However, Fletcher et al. teach wherein the initiating step comprises the step of: periodically initiating an update (column 12, lines 45-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to initiate an update at specific intervals. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

motivated to perform such a modification to update software remotely and automatically (Fletcher et al., column 4, lines 51-62).

Regarding claims 3, 24, and 45, the combination of Rowley and Hodges et al. does not expressly disclose wherein the initiating step comprises the step of: initiating an update based on at least one predefined condition. However, Fletcher et al. teach wherein the initiating step comprises the step of: initiating an update based on at least one predefined condition (column 4, lines 51-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to initiate an update at specific intervals. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to update software remotely and automatically (Fletcher et al., column 4, lines 51-62).

8.   **Claims 11-12, 32-33, and 53-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowley and Hodges et al. as applied to claims 1, 22, and 43 respectively above, and further in view of Gupta et al. (US Patent Number: 6,226,752).**

Regarding claims 11, 32, and 53, the combination of Rowley and Hodges et al. does not expressly disclose logging in to a server containing an update. However, Gupta et al. teach logging in to a server (column 12, lines 24-40) containing an update. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to require users to log in to a server prior to updating software. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a

modification to ensure a particular user is authorized and authenticated prior to permitting access to the information (Gupta et al., column 4, lines 30-40).

Regarding claims 12, 33, and 54, the combination of Rowley, Hodges et al., and Gupta et al. teaches the limitations as set forth under claims 11, 32, and 53 respectively above. Furthermore, Gupta et al. teach wherein the logging in step comprises at least one of: transmitting a username and password, filling and submitting an online form, accessing a cookie, and redirecting to another location (column 12, lines 24-40).

9.   Claims 15-17, 19, 36-38, 40, 57-59, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowley and Hodges et al. as applied to claims 14, 35, and 56 respectively above, and further in view of Gupta et al.

Regarding claims 15, 36, and 57, the combination of Rowley and Hodges et al. does not expressly disclose logging in to a server containing an update. However, Gupta et al. teach logging in to a server (column 12, lines 24-40) containing an update. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to require users to log in to a server prior to updating software. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to ensure a particular user is authorized and authenticated prior to permitting access to the information (Gupta et al., column 4, lines 30-40).

Regarding claims 16, 37, and 58, the combination of Rowley, Hodges et al., and Gupta et al. teaches the limitations as set forth under claims 15, 36, and 57 respectively above. Furthermore, Gupta et al. teach wherein the logging in step comprises at least

one of: transmitting a username and password, filling and submitting an online form,

accessing a cookie, and redirecting to another location (column 12, lines 24-40).

Regarding claims 17, 38, and 59, the combination of Rowley, Hodges et al., and

Gupta et al. teaches the limitations as set forth under claims 16, 37, and 58 respectively

above. Furthermore, Rowley teaches wherein the standard protocol comprises

hypertext transfer protocol or file transfer protocol (column 3, lines 5-10, column 7, lines

10-15).

Regarding claims 19, 40, and 61, the combination of Rowley, Hodges et al., and

Gupta et al. teaches the limitations as set forth under claims 17, 38, and 59 respectively

above. Furthermore, Rowley teaches wherein the information relating to the information

to be updated and the information relating to the plurality of updates comprises script or

data files including information indicating the information to be updated and the

information relating to the plurality of updates (column 2, lines 23-54, column 5, lines

35-65).

10.   **Claims 20-21, 41-42, and 62-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Rowley, Hodges et al., and Gupta et al. as applied to claims 17,

38, and 59 respectively above, and further in view of Fletcher et al.

Regarding claims 20, 41, and 62, the combination of Rowley, Hodges et al., and

Gupta et al. does not disclose expressly wherein the initiating step comprises the step

of: periodically initiating an update. Hodges et al. teach periodically updating an anti-

virus application. However, Fletcher et al. teach wherein the initiating step comprises

the step of: periodically initiating an update (column 12, lines 45-56). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to initiate an update at specific intervals. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to update software remotely and automatically (Fletcher et al., column 4, lines 51-62).

Regarding claims 21, 42, and 63, the combination of Rowley, Hodges et al., and Gupta et al. does not disclose expressly wherein the initiating step comprises the step of: initiating an update based on at least one predefined condition. However, Fletcher et al. teach wherein the initiating step comprises the step of: initiating an update based on at least one predefined condition (column 4, lines 51-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to initiate an update at specific intervals. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to update software remotely and automatically (Fletcher et al., column 4, lines 51-62).

11.   **Claims 66-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowley and Hodges et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Fletcher et al.**

Regarding claim 66, the combination of Rowley and Hodges et al. does not expressly disclose wherein the update control program includes a protocol handler, a configuration manager, an update scheduler, and unpacking routines. Rowley teaches a protocol handler (column 3, lines 1-67, column 4, lines 1-67, column 7, lines 10-15), a configuration manager (column 5, lines 29-65), unpacking routines (column 6, lines 57-58). Fletcher et al. teach an update scheduler (column 12, lines 45-56). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to include a protocol handler, a configuration manager, an update scheduler,

and unpacking routines with the system of Rowley and Hodges et al. One of ordinary

skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it was well known in the art

to configure applications/programs to run/execute correctly in a computer system.

Regarding claim 67, the combination of Rowley, Hodges et al., and Fletcher et al.

teaches the limitations as set forth under claim 66 above. Furthermore, Fletcher et al.

teach wherein the update scheduler provides a capability to schedule when updates are

to occur (column 12, lines 45-56). Rowley teaches to select which of the virus profiles

and the anti-virus programs are to be updated (column 5, lines 29-65).

Regarding claim 68, the combination of Rowley, Hodges et al., and Fletcher et al.

teaches the limitations as set forth under claim 67 above. Furthermore, Rowley teaches

wherein the configuration manager provides a capability to examine configurations to

determine which of the virus profiles and the anti-virus programs are to be updated

(column 5, lines 29-65).

Regarding claim 69, the combination of Rowley, Hodges et al., and Fletcher et al.

teaches the limitations as set forth under claim 68 above. Furthermore, Rowley teaches

wherein the determination is carried out by comparing the version numbers, the creation

dates, and the modification dates of update files stored on the virus update server with

the virus profiles (column 2, lines 23-54, column 5, lines 35-65).

Regarding claim 70, the combination of Rowley, Hodges et al., and Fletcher et al.

teaches the limitations as set forth under claim 69 above. Furthermore, Rowley teaches

wherein the protocol handler provides a capability to transfer the updates using a

plurality of protocols including hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP), file transfer protocol

(FTP), and proprietary protocols (column 3, lines 5-10, column 7, lines 10-15).

Regarding claim 71, the combination of Rowley, Hodges et al., and Fletcher et al.

teaches the limitations as set forth under claim 70 above. Furthermore, Rowley teaches

wherein the unpacking routines provide a capability to unpack the updates to correct

locations by decompressing compressed files (column 6, lines 57-58), decrypting

encrypted files (column 6, lines 57-59), and copying files to directories (column 6, lines

53-67).

Regarding claim 72, the combination of Rowley, Hodges et al., and Fletcher et al.

teaches the limitations as set forth under claim 71 above. Furthermore, Fletcher et al.

.teach wherein the update instructions control an operation of the update control

program by specifying when updates are to occur and which of the virus profiles and the

anti-virus programs are to be updated (column 12, lines 45-56). Rowley teaches

wherein the version numbers, and the creation and modification dates that are to be

used to determine what needs to be updated (column 2, lines 23-54, column 5, lines 35-

65); protocols that are to be used (column 3, lines 5-10, column 7, lines 10-15); and

locations to which files are to be unpacked (column 6, lines 53-67).

Conclusion

12.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to David G. Cervetti whose telephone number is (571) 272-

5861. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00 am - 5:00 pm, off

on Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DGC

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100